DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 039 CS 205 090

AUTHOR Culbertson, Hugh M.
TITLE The Neutral and Participant Perspectives--Do They Have Unique Meanings for Magazine Students?
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (62nd, Houston, Texas, August 5-8, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; Editing; Factor Analysis; Journalism; *Journalism Education; Newspapers; *News Writing; Periodicals; Perspective Taking; Research; *Role Perception; *Student Attitudes; *Task Performance; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS Audience Awareness

ABSTRACT

A total of 123 upper-level and graduate students in journalism completed a questionnaire on beliefs about newspaper work. Most of the students were in advanced writing and editing courses, while 32 were in magazine courses. Questions in the survey dealt with beliefs related to James Grunig's theory of information systems. Factor analysis suggested a single problem recognition factor, two concepts relating to decision rules, two on constraints, and a single audience-orientation variable. In general, students rated newsroom decision making as complex and high on uncertainty (problem recognition). They saw a strong need for audience study. Also, while expressing a preference for formal newspaper makeup and high regard for objectivity, they tended to downgrade "news elements" in news assessment, event reporting, and sensationalism. Although students in both magazine and nonmagazine courses agreed on beliefs about the newspaper setting in general, the magazine course students did stress perceived audience interests more and their own preferences less in newspaper editing. Overall, the data suggest that the "neutral" and "participant" perspectives underlie belief clusters held by today's journalism students. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED175039

THE NEUTRAL AND PARTICIPANT PERSPECTIVES -- DO THEY HAVE UNIQUE MEANINGS FOR MAGAZINE STUDENTS?

by

Hugh M. Culbertson

Professor of Journalism

Ohio University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hugh M. Culbertson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the Magazine Division, Association for Education in Journalism, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, August 6, 1979.

CS205090

In recent years, American news personnel and media scholars have been questioning traditional beliefs and practices in journalism. Terms such as new journalism,[1] participant reporting,[2] depth reporting,[3] precision journalism,[4] and specialized reporting[5] have come to the fore.

In the wake of this discussion -- and of the controversial application of marketing approaches to television news[6] and newspapers[7] -- much effort has been devoted to defining beliefs about goals, standards of performance, and ethics.[8] Some consensus on such beliefs is needed for professionalization, according to sociologists.[9]

A nation-wide survey of over 1,300 working journalists[10] and intensive case studies of two prominent American newspapers[11] indicate that beliefs -- and the journalists who hold them -- fall empirically into at least two distinct if not homogeneous clusters:

1. A neutral school. Proponents of this viewpoint see news as emerging naturally from events. Responsible journalism is said to require objectivity and factual accuracy, which may become "ritualized as justifications for the truth value of information which a reporter transmits."[12] Neutral journalists object with special vigor to coverage which is biased, sensational or excessive -- to sins of comission which get in the way of telling nothing but the truth.[13]

2. A participant school. While generally subscribing to a concept of fairness, journalists of this persuasion see the reporter as actively and subjectively involved in defining truth. He or she must report news in context, sifting[14] through available information to find implications, causes and meanings.[15] Primary journalist sins include news suppression, irrelevance and superficiality -- sins of omission in which one fails to reveal the whole truth.[16]

There is evidence that journalists are coming to hold such beliefs and feel an increasing commitment to the public-service and self-sacrifice elements of professionalism.[17] Unfortunately, most studies, including the present one, have focused largely on the newspaper setting. However, beliefs about newspaper work certainly shed light on the role and function of magazines. After all, some newspaper people such as David Halberstam have gone to work for magazines partly because they had trouble dealing with stylistic, bureaucratic and time constraints in newsrooms.[18] Furthermore, many if not most journalism students take several courses taught from a newspaper perspective.

Beliefs about constraints and routinization take on a new and theoretically significant meaning in James Grunig's information systems theory.[19] This study seeks to build on Grunig's theory, which says in part that openness and intensity of information seeking are greatest where one finds:

1. Recognition of a problem -- an element of indeterminacy which needs to be resolved. Drawing on John Dewey, Grunig suggests such recognition helps lead one to define new alternatives rather than repeat behaviors or continue to keep assumptions held earlier.

2. Perception of few constraints to communication and the use of information gained through it. Where such constraints are recognized, communication may be minimal (or in some cases, limited to identifying and surmounting constraints).[20]

3. Lack of domination by simple referent criteria or decision rules. Such a rule (for example, a mandate to balance informative with entertaining news in a certain ratio each day) can act as a kind of short-cut formula -- reducing the range and amount of information seen as needed to define situations and make decisions.[21]

These concepts have obvious relevance to the neutral vs. participant distinction.

Newsroom constraints include advertiser pressure, physical location, deadlines, space limitations, bureaucratic norms, and chains of command.[22] To the participant journalist, such constraints doubtless seem arbitrary, limiting and somewhat avoidable.[23] The neutral, on the other hand, is likely to view them as necessary -- and as tolerable even if bothersome.

Problem recognition focuses on the complexity of decisions and the need for careful thought and analysis in making them. As noted earlier, neutrals feel truth is revealed naturally, so one can simply check the facts. Participants, on the other hand, see a higher level of subjectivity and complexity.

Referent criteria or decision rules are codified in textbooks.[24] Young journalists study news pegs or elements (criteria such as consequence to readers, human interest, timeliness, unexpectedness, etc.). Other rules specify that local names and places build audience, that events rather than issues determine coverage, and that prominent names warrant emphasis. Widespread use of these rules may simplify the news-judgment process, making careful analysis of audiences and contexts seem unnecessary.

The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine beliefs about the newspaper setting -- defined from an information-systems perspective -- and see how they correlated with each other. We hoped to find belief clusters which might help illuminate the neutral vs. participant distinction.

Also, we searched for differences between magazine and other journalism students, testing the hypotheses that:

1. Magazine students would tend to see substantial differences between their own news preferences and those prevalent in the small town where they were studying. In coorientation terms, these students should score lower on congruency than would people in other sequences.

2. Magazine students would be inclined to follow perceived audience preferences rather than their own, where the two differ, in making editorial decisions. Non-magazine majors should show a lesser tendency, if any, in this direction.

These hypotheses stem from our assumption that magazine courses stress audience definition and study. Magazines texts[25] appear to emphasize such processes more than do newspaper-oriented reporting[26] and editing[27] texts.

Methods

Respondents. In all, 123 upper-level and graduate students in journalism were tested at Ohio University and Toledo University. Fifteen of the students were enrolled in a mass communication theory seminar at the graduate level. All others tested were in advanced reporting, news editing, editorial page, magazine editing, magazine feature writing and magazine production courses.

Obviously, results with these respondents cannot be applied to working journalists. However, it was felt that advanced and intermediate students at professionally oriented schools merit study. Unlike many practicing news people, students have thought recently and fairly intensively about professional norms and standards. Relationships among beliefs may show up quite clearly in such a population.

Measurement. Forty-seven Likert -type questions were cast in a five-point agree-disagree format to test information-systems concepts. Between nine and 13 items were designed to tap each of four concepts.

A previous study indicated that referent criteria fall into two clusters. We sought to measure each. The first encompassed news elements. The second, called rule-orientation, dealt with belief or disbelief in such conventions as the inverted pyramid and the summary lead, balance in layout, and objectivity.

Constraints were thought to come from time and space limitations, advertiser pressure and media-executive dictates.

We sought to tap problem recognition with items on perception of news judgment as a simple, routine process, perceived agreement among journalists in judging news, level of felt need for extensive training, and the need for time in decision-making.

Finally, three items dealt with the importance of audience study in the editorial process. These items related to the diachronic-synchronic distinction suggested by Thayer[28] and emphasized by Grunig[29] and Hesse.[30]

Factor analyses were done separately on items designed to tap each of the five concepts listed above. Principal-axis solutions and varimax rotations were completed, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

With each of the first four analyses (on news elements, rule-orientation, problem recognition, and constraints), three factors had eigenvalues of at least .50. In each instance, we ran both a three-factor and a four-factor solution, reporting the former in table 1. A minimum of two items were used to define a given factor. Furthermore, an item helped define a dimension only if:

1. Its primary loading was on that factor in both the three-factor and four-factor solutions.

2. The item's primary loading was at least .42. In all but four cases, this figure was at least .50. Three-factor solutions were analyzed here.

3. The item's primary loading exceeded its second highest by at least .20.

The analysis of audience-orientation yielded only one factor, being based on just three items.

Since each information-systems notion was the object of a separate factor-analytic procedure, the principle axis solutions did not minimize inter-index correlations. These coefficients were low enough to indicate separate underlying concepts were tapped. However, correlations clustered in systematic and meaningful ways as noted later.

Three items which did not help define factors seemed central to "conventional wisdom" about newsroom work. These focused on objectivity (keeping opinions out of news columns), emphasis on event rather than issue reporting, and respect for traditional practices in journalism. Each of these items served as a single-item index in certain analyses. Table 2 gives question wording.

In testing the study's two a priori hypotheses, we measured congruency with a single item worded as follows:

> We'd like you to assume you are working in the newsroom of a daily paper in your university community. People living in this region are a diverse lot. However, we'd like you to think of a typical or average reader of the paper and assess how similar of different you and that reader probably are as to the news stories you would find worth reading. Indicate whether you and the typical reader have news tastes that are:
>
> _____extremely similar
> _____fairly similar
> _____not very similar
> _____not similar at all

In measuring one's tendency to follow own or audience perspectives, we asked a single question of our 91 non-magazine respondents. In introducing the item, we noted that an editor often realizes a story which interests him or her won't interest too many readers, and vice versa. We then asked respondents to indicate how much they'd weigh own vs. audience interests on a scale from -3 (follow audience completely) to +3 (follow own interests completely). The 0 or neutral point was defined as weighing both perspectives equally.

Some anecdotal data in this initial phase suggested that emphasis on self need not come at the expense of audience, or vice versa. A person could conceivably ignore both -- attending to news-source interests, scholarly assessment of needs, or other factors. Also, one could strive to accommodate both viewpoints.

In light of this, we used one question to measure followership of the audience, another to get at autonomy (judging news on the basis of one's own interests and preferences), with our magazine-course students. Each question involved ratings on a scale from -3, ignore own (or audience) interests completely, to +3, follow own (or audience) interests completely.

While the measures differed, both permitted us to identify people who leaned toward autonomy more than followership. Such respondents gave positive ratings(+1, +2, or +3) in our one-item data set, higher scores on autonomy than on followership with the two-item approach. In like fashion, we were able to identify those with stronger followership than autonomy.

Results

As shown in table 1, factor analysis revealed only one concept, tapped by three items, dealing with problem recognition. These items focused on perception of news judgment as simple and routine, the need for a news editor to be widely read and well educated, and the amount of thought and analysis which goes into good news assessment.

Rule-orientation encompassed two distinct factors:

1. Writing style, with two items on the extent to which newspaper writing has become more innovative and less dominated by such formulae as the inverted pyramid and the summary lead in recent years.

2. Layout style, tapped by three items centering on the extent to which informal makeup has and should become salient, lessening emphasis on order and balance.

News-element orientation also yielded two interpretable factors. The first, news-element utility, hinged on two items dealing with the general usefulness of such elements as consequence, conflict and timeliness in judging news. The second concept, also described with two items, involved the need for news people to place substantial emphasis on conflict, bad news and sensationalism.

Analyses on newsroom constraint revealed two additional concepts which appeared to be relatively independent of each other. The first, labeled constrained opportunity, stemmed from three items on the degree to which newspaper time and space constraints are seen as limiting initiative and creativity, perhaps leading some employees to think of leaving. Second, two items dealt with the oft-claimed tendency of publishers and top executives to dictate news judgment.

In the fifth and final factor analysis, three items on audience-orientation correlated significantly with each other and hung together in a single-factor solution. These statements had to do with the importance of audience study in editorial work.

Put table 1 about here.

Once defined, indices were used to describe overall interests and leanings of our student respondents. Some interesting conclusions emerge.

Put table 2 about here.

First, students saw a substantial need for audience study. We'd expected to see more felt need in magazine classes, where audience definition and analysis are stressed, than in other areas. However, both the magazine and non-magazine groups averaged about 7.75, with a range of possible values from 2 to 10.

Second, problem recognition scores were high. Students apparently bought the notion -- no doubt stressed in classes -- that news judgment is a complex process not easily handled with simple decision rules. Given a need to take a complex, heterogeneous audience into account, of course, problem recognition could hardly be low.

Third, the students showed signs of buying certain journalistic traditions. They showed some liking for balance and some formality in newspaper makeup -- a finding which surprised us somewhat in light of previous research on college students by Click and Stempel.[31] Their data showed a widespread tendency to see traditional vertical pages as quite ethical but relatively unattractive. We conjecture that journalism students may be led by their course work to place a fair amount of emphasis on the concepts of ethics and responsibility.

In further data bearing on traditions, our respondents placed high emphasis on objectivity -- separating fact from opinion. And the basic notion of "traditional journalistic practices," without definition, received considerable approval.

Fourth, some "conventional wisdom" about news drew fairly widespread criticism. Many respondents doubted the utility of news elements and the need for sensationalism in newspaper coverage, as well as the notion that event coverage is clearly more important than analysis of issues.

In the area of newsroom constraints, feelings were mixed. Relatively few people felt time and space constraints are leading lots of bright newspersons to consider leaving the newspaper business. Yet a substantial number expressed concern -- perhaps learned from journalism reviews and media-and-society classes -- about front-office pressure on the newsroom.

We were somewhat surprised that magazine and newspaper-course students differed very, very little as to beliefs about news work. We compared the two groups on our summed indices as well as on questionnaire items taken one at a time. There were actually fewer differences than one might expect by chance!

In retrospect, this last finding makes sense. Basic journalism courses tend to focus heavily on newspaper work. And students from all sequences tend to take the same introductory courses. It's important to remember that we were dealing with students' perceptions of newspaper work -- not with their own career goals and plans.

In testing hypothesis one, we also found no clear difference between the two groups. Congruency was fairly high throughout, with about half of both magazine-and newspaper-course students seeing themselves as "fairly similar" in news interest to residents of the university towns in which they were studying. Slightly over one-third checked the "not very similar" response, with very few marking "extremely similar" or "not similar at all." Thus hypothesis one was not confirmed.

As shown in table 3, however, hypothesis two was confirmed. When asked to assume their news interests did differ from their audiences', magazine-oriented students showed a very strong tendency to follow perceived audience tendencies rather than their own. Newspaper-course students, on the other hand, split fairly evenly between self and audience. It appears that course work and/or magazine-related experience may have increased the audience's salience even when judging news for a hypothetical newspaper.

A caveat seems in order here. A small number of magazine majors in non-magazine courses, and vice versa, may have obscured some differences in our analysis. However, the difference between magazine and other majors on autonomy and followership is so marked that it seems safe to assume sequence plays a part.

Put table 3 about here.

Returning to the information-systems concepts, we looked to zero-order correlations among indices for some hint as to whether these variables might cluster together in ways consistent with the neutral and participant perspectives. Some intriguing clues did appear -- centering mostly on layout style and constrained opportunity.

The respondents scoring high on layout style (and thereby showing disapproval of informal makeup as well as doubts about its prevalence) showed signs of the neutral viewpoint. They saw news elements as fairly useful and voiced general approval of traditional journalistic practice. And they did not see newspaper time and space limitations as unbearably restrictive.

At the same time, high scorers on layout style saw the news business as complex and problematic. Further, they showed a slight tendency to emphasize issue rather than event coverage. In sum, they were "thoughtful" neutrals, respecting traditional concepts but not seeing the newsperson as a simple blotter for gathering or conveyor belt for reporting "facts."

In analyses not shown in table 4, approval of objectivity also correlated with certain concepts mentioned above. The believer in objectivity showed a fairly strong tendency to respect traditional practice ($r=.25$, $p<.01$), and mild inclinations to emphasize news elements ($r=.16$, $p<.05$) as well as event reportage ($r=.15$, $p<.05$). The "objectivist," it appears, bought traditions in a relatively unquestioning way, while the person scoring high on layout style did not. Objectivity and layout style did not correlate ($r=.04$, $p>.05$).

Put table 4 about here.

Returning to table 4, the person scoring high on constrained opportunity (i. e., believing that many talented people want to leave the newspaper business because of constraints) tended to resemble the participant as defined by Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman.[32] Specifically, this respondent:

1. tended to downgrade the importance of and need for formal layout, news elements, audience study, and traditional practice in general.

2. saw problem recognition as fairly low in the newspaper business, perhaps reflecting a view that formulae and traditions prevail there.

3. showed a nearly significant tendency (r=.12, p=.086) to believe that good news coverage does require fairly substantial emphasis on conflict, bad news and sensationalism. Many "new journalists" provide such coverage.

Taken together, these results suggest a kind of irreverent desire to cast aside journalistic traditions and contemporary ideals.[33] They suggest a viewpoint rather akin to the new journalism espoused by innovators and rebels of the late 1960s and early 1970s. And certainly they contrast with the serious-minded traditionalists defined by our analysis of layout style and its correlates.

Summary and Conclusions

This study indicated that magazine-sequence students in two professionally oriented schools agreed with their colleagues in other sequences on beliefs about newspapering.

When we looked at ways in which students felt they would behave, however, an important difference showed up. Magazine students tended overwhelmingly to want to follow audience rather than own interests when judging the news, given a conflict between the two.

There is an obvious need to examine the generalizability of this finding -- and the extent to which it holds over time as students follow varied career paths. This seems, in fact, to be a major issue for contemporary journalism. Certainly magazine editors such as Norman Cousins have experienced intense conflict between inclinations to follow their own judgment and demands that they "play to an audience" when making editorial decisions.[34]

Our data suggest that the neutral and participant perspectives may underly belief clusters held by today's journalism students.

However, there's also a hint that the neutral viewpoint emphasizes careful, analytical approaches to the field. At any rate, participants do not appear to corner the market when it comes to endorsing journalistic innovation and thoughtfulness.

In research now underway, we are using measures of information-systems concepts to predict certain types of editorial behavior. Results to date suggest that open-minded, analytic people, as defined by the Grunig model, do tend, as predicted, to perceive differences in news preference between self and audience. Noting such differences (or at least, being alert to their possible existence) seems like an important step toward enlightened editing.

If further validated, belief clusters of the type noted here should be of interest to journalism educators. Classroom teaching may have helped build the clusters found. And the author would argue that educational goals should focus on them as well as on traditional writing, editing and newsgathering skills.

We hope to check news-related beliefs held by working journalists in the near future. Work in the news media may reinforce or obliterate belief clusters. Also, work environments may change the relative salience of clusters without altering them drastically.

TABLE 1

Factor Analyses of Newsroom-Belief Items Associated with Each of Five Information-Systems Concepts

PROBLEM RECOGNITION	Factor I (Problem Recognition)	Factor II	Factor III
News judgment is a fairly simple, routine process.(-)	.66	.05	.07
A newspaper editor need not be widely read and well educated to judge spot news effectively.(-)	.54	.01	.02
Effective judgment of spot news requires very little thought and analysis.(-)	.64	.10	.01
Percentage of common-factor variance accounted for by each factor	49%	28%	22%
RULE ORIENTATION	**Factor I (Writing Style)**	**Factor II (Layout Style)**	**Factor III**
Newspaper writing is governed much less today than it was 10 or 20 years ago by "formulae" such as the inverted-pyramid structure and the summary lead.(-)	.82	.06	.01
Innovative writing which deviates from traditions such as the inverted pyramid and the summary lead is substantially more common today in American newspapers than it was several years ago.(-)	.65	.04	.13
Current trends in newspaper layout free editors from a need to position stories, pictures and headlines for orderly balance and flow.(-)	.04	.42	-.20
Informal newspaper layout, freeing editors from a need to position stories, pictures and headlines for orderly balance and flow, is healthy.(-)	.14	.71	-.03
A newspaper should strive for informal appearance.(-)	-.01	.54	.08
Percentage of common-factor variance accounted for by each factor	51%	29%	20%

TABLE 1 (cont.)

NEWS-ELEMENT ORIENTATION	Factor I (News-Element Utility)	Factor II (Sensational-ism)	Factor III
News judgment is so complex and nebulous that "news elements" such as consequence, conflict and timeliness provide only a crude beginning in understanding it.(-)	.46	.07	.05
The widespread concern for timeliness often harms journalism by helping to make news coverage superficial.(-)	.54	.12	.05
Good news judgment necessarily involves heavy emphasis on conflict and bad news.(+)	.06	.63	.40
Some reporting of sensational news is necessary to cover life accurately and completely.(+)	-.33	.73	.45
Percentage of common-factor variance accounted for by each factor	42%	35%	22%

CONSTRAINTS	Factor I (Constrained Opportunity)	Factor II (Executive Pressure)	Factor III
Most articles in a newspaper are shorter than needed to help readers understand what is reported. (+)	.42	-.09	-.10
Journalists who work for American newspapers have little opportunity to show initiative and be creative.(+)	.71	.03	.50
Limitations of space and time are so great in newspaper work that most bright, creative editorial employees at least seriously consider leaving to write books or magazine articles.(+)	.43	.10	-.09
The publisher and other top executives largely dictate what stories a journalist should emphasize.(+)	.21	.57	.14
By and large, American publishers and other top newspaper executives do little to influence or dictate news judgment.(-)	-.05	.78	-.04
Percentage of common-factor variance accounted for by each factor	50%	33%	17%

TABLE 1 (cont.)

AUDIENCE-ORIENTATION	Factor I (Audience-Orientation)
Careful study of reader interests and preferences in the news really isn't worth the time and effort required.(-)	.53
If editors and reporters don't stay in touch with their audiences, people will quit buying newspapers.(+)	.43
In judging the news, a journalist who worries a lot about audience interests and preferences is apt to perform poorly.(-)	.59

Only items used to describe a listed factor are included above. The first four solutions generated three factors each, with no label being attached to factors not described by at least two items. A minus sign indicates that a given item was scored negatively, with a value of 5 assigned to a "strongly disagree" response and 1 to "strongly agree." Where a plus sign appears, the reverse or positive scoring was done.

TABLE 2

Mean Scores on Newsroom-Belief Indices

Index	Mean Score(n=123)	Standard Error of Mean
Belief in importance of objectivity in newspaper writing, preventing personal opinion from affecting the news	8.78*	.085
Problem recognition	8.13**	.219
Audience orientation	7.78	.151
Belief in traditional journalistic practices	7.15*	.100
Layout style	7.15**	.233
Executive pressure	7.12*	.177
Belief in primacy of covering events in newspapers, with issues deserving coverage primarily as reflected in daily events	6.26	.129
Sensationalism	6.18	.143
Constrained opportunity	5.40**	.206
News-element utility	5.30	.157

*This was a one-item index with raw scores ranging from a lowest possible value of 1 to a highest value of 5. The score reported here is the raw score x 2, making the figure comparable with data from 2-item indices.

**This was a three-item index with raw scores ranging from a lowest possible value of 3 to a highest value of 15. The score reported here is the raw score x .667, making the figure comparable with data from 2-item indices.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Respondents from Newspaper and Magazine Classes Showing a Tendency Toward Autonomy vs. Followership

	Students in newspaper-oriented classes (n=91)	Students in magazine-oriented classes (n=32)
Those indicating a greater leaning toward followership (looking at perceived audience interests in judging news for a local paper) than toward autonomy (judging on the basis of own interests)	43%	81%
Those indicating an equal tendency toward followership and autonomy	23%	16%
Those indicating a greater leaning toward autonomy than toward followership	34%	3%

The two groups differed significantly. (X^2=12.51, 1 df, $p < .01$; with two bottom rows combined to achieve sufficient sample size.)

TABLE 4

Product-moment Correlations (zero order) Between Layout Style, Constrained Opportunity and Other Indices

Layout Style	Constrained Opportunity
Problem recognition ($r=.32$, $p<.001$)	Layout style ($r=-.40$, $p<.001$)
Constrained opportunity ($r=-.40$, $p<.001$)	Approval of traditional journalistic practices ($r=-.20$, $p<.02$)
News-element utility ($r=.29$, $p<.001$)	News-element utility ($r=-.34$, $p<.001$)
Approval of traditional journalistic practices ($r=.15$, $p<.05$)	Audience-orientation ($r=-.16$, $p<.05$)
Approval of event-orientation in reporting ($r=-.15$, $p=.05$)	Problem recognition ($r=-.19$, $p<.02$)

Only correlations significant at the .05 level are reported here.

Footnotes

1. Michael L. Johnson, The New Journalism (Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas Press, 1971); Paul Scanlon, ed., Reporting: The Rolling Stone Style (Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977).

2. For prime examples of participant reporting, see Norman Mailer, Of a Fire on the Moon (New York: The New American Library, 1971); Hunter S. Thompson, Fear and Loathing on the Campaign Trail '72 (New York: The Popular Library, 1973).

3. Neale Copple, Depth Reporting: An Approach to Journalism (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 45-60.

4. Philip Meyer, Precision Journalism (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973).

5. Hugh M. Culbertson, "Systems Thinking in Public Relations Research and Some of its Ancestors," paper presented to the Conference on the Changing Face of Public Communication, San Jose, Calif., April 1973; James Grunig, Decline of the Global Village (Bayside, N. Y.: General Hall, Inc., 1976); Richard Maisel, "The Decline of Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly 37:159- 70 (1973); John C. Merrill and Ralph L. Lowenstein, Media, Messages and Men (New York: David McKay, 1971), pp. 37-41; Robert Root, Modern Magazine Editing (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1966), pp. 3-12.

6. Ron Powers, "Eyewitness News," Columbia Journalism Review 16:17-21, 23, 24 (May/June 1977).

7. Fergus M. Bordewich, "Supermarketing the Newspaper," Columbia Journalism Review 16:24-30 (September/October 1977); Philip Meyer, "In Defense of the Marketing Approach," Columbia Journalism Review 16:60-62 (January/February 1978).

8. For an overview of related issues, see David J. Leroy and Christopher H. Sterling, eds., Mass News: Practices, Controversies and Alternatives (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), pp. 240- 80.

9. Rue Bucher and Joan G. Stelling, Becoming Professional (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publishing Co., 1978); David J. Leroy, "Journalism as a Profession," in Leroy and Sterling, op. cit., pp. 250- 53; William L. Rivers and Wilbur Schramm, Responsibility in Mass Communication (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 240- 49.

10. John W. C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski and William W. Bowman, The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and their Work (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976), pp. 114- 16 .

11. Chris Argyris, Behind the Front Page (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), pp. 47-53; Leon V. Sigal, Reporters and Officials: the Organization and Politics of Newsmaking (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1973), pp. 75-79.

12. Johnstone, et. al., op. cit., p. 114.

13. Ibid., pp. 122-23.

14. There are, of course, many approaches to the sifting process. Included are survey research, scholarly analysis of public records, and "participant observer" techniques drawn from the social sciences.

15. Johnstone, et. al., op. cit., p. 115.

16. Ibid., p. 122. For an overview on related philosophical issues, see John C. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney, eds., Ethics and the Press (New York: Hastings House, 1975), pp. 60-107.

17. Jack McLeod and Searle Hawley, Jr., "Professionalization Among Newsmen," Journalism Quarterly 41:529-39 (1964); Jack McLeod and Ramona Rush, "Professionalization of Latin American and U. S. Journalists," Journalism Quarterly 46:583-90 (1969); Jack McLeod and Ramona Rush, "Professionalization of Latin American and U. S. Journalists: Part II," Journalism Quarterly 46:784-89 (1969).

18. Gay Talese, The Kingdom and the Power (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), pp. 555-57.

19. James E. Grunig, "Organizations and Public Relations: Testing a Communication Theory," Journalism Monographs, volume 46 (1976).

20. James E. Grunig, "Communication Behaviors Occurring in Decision and Nondecision Situations," Journalism Quarterly 53:252-63 (1976).

21. Ibid.

22. Argyris, op. cit., pp. 1-33; Warren Breed, "Social Control in the Newsroom," Social Forces 33:326-35 (1955).

23. Sigal, op. cit., pp. 13-34; Talese, op. cit., pp. 555-57.

24. Mitchell V. Charnley, Reporting (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), chapters 1-3; Ralph S. Izard, Hugh M. Culbertson and Donald A. Lambert, Fundamentals of News Reporting (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Co., 1977), chapters 2, 4 and 5; Sigal, op. cit., pp. 65-75.

25. J. W. Click and Russell N. Baird, Magazine Editing and Production (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1979), ch. 7; Robert Root, Modern Magazine Editing (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1966), ch. 18.

26. Izard, et. al., op. cit., ch. 13; Michael Ryan and James W. Tankard, Jr., Basic News Reporting (Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1977), ch. 11.

27. Floyd K. Baskette and Jack Z. Sissors, The Art of Editing (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1977); Bruce H. Westley, News Editing (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972).

28. Lee Thayer, Communication and Communication Systems (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin Co., 1968), pp. 129-30.

29. James E. Grunig, "Organizations and Public Relations: Testing a Communication Theory," Journalism Monographs 46:6 (1976).

30. Michael B. Hesse, "A Coorientation Study of Wisconsin State Senators and their Constituencies," Journalism Quarterly 53:626-33,660(1976).

31. J. W. Click and Guido H. Stempel III, "Reader Response to Newspaper Front-Page Format," Journal of Typographic Research 2:127-42 (1968).

32. Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman, op. cit., pp. 114-32.

33. We assume here that news elements have been widely accepted as useful aids in news judgment. Also, reasonably formal makeup seems to have been associated -- at least, until quite recently -- with prestige newspapers. Audience study as an aid to editorial decision-making, while not universally accepted by any means in the newspaper business, has gained enough respectability in "establishment" circles to earn a widely used label, precision journalism. Our high scorers on "constrained opportunity," like new journalists ranging from Hunter S. Thompson to Studs Terkel, reject all of these concepts to some extent.

34. Norman Cousins, speech delivered at Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, May 7, 1971; Fred Ferretti, "The Short, Unhappy Life of 'Saturday Review II'," Columbia Journalism Review 12:23-31 (July-August 1973).